

REMARKS

The foregoing amendment and the following arguments are provided generally to impart precision to the claims, by more particularly pointing out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 11, 13-16, 19, 21-24 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothschild (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0003867) in view of Gisby (U.S. Patent No. 5,943,416). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Rothschild and Gisby do not disclose the following feature recited in independent claims 1 and 11.

“receiving from a user at least one search criterion via an audio connection, the at least one search criterion including a threshold for a quality of service rating;

...

while the user remains connected to the audio connection, prompting the user for the quality of service rating for services rendered by the selected service provider in response to a detected completion of the live conversation.”

In Rothschild, a customer is required to call a central server to go through a menu tree, organized by business categories, to select one business in order to have the call routed to the selected business. Rothschild does not disclose Applicant claimed feature of “a threshold for a quality of service rating” for the search of a list of service providers. Gisby is limited to a technique to conduct survey after a customer finishes a transaction with an agent of a call center.

Claim 21 also recites “to receive at least one search criterion in an audio form from a user, via the audio connection, the at least one search criterion including a threshold of a quality of service rating” and “while the user remains connected to the audio connection, the processor to prompt the user for the quality of service rating for services rendered by the selected service provider in response to a detected completion of the live conversation”.

Since Rothschild and Gisby do not disclose Applicant's claimed feature of "the at least one search criterion including *a threshold of a quality of service rating*" to present a list of service providers, where the user is prompted for "*the quality of service rating* for services rendered by the selected service provider" in response to a detected completion of the live conversation between the user and the user selected service provider, claims 1, 11 and 21 and their dependent claims are patentable over Rothschild and Gisby.

Claims 2, 7-8, 10, 12, 17-18, 20 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothschild in view of Gisby, and further in view of Shaffer (U.S. Patent No. 5,901,214). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Shaffer cannot cure the deficiency in Rothschild and Gisby discussed above in connection with claims 1, 11 and 21. Thus, claims 2, 7-8, 10, 12, 17-18, 20 and 25 are patentable over Rothschild, Gisby and Shaffer.

Claims 1-2, 7-9, 11-12, 17-19, 21-22 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Levin (U.S. Patent No. 6,173,279) in view of Gisby (U.S. Patent No. 5,943,416). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Levin and Gisby do not disclose the following feature recited in independent claims 1 and 11.

"receiving from a user at least one search criterion via an audio connection, the at least one search criterion including *a threshold for a quality of service rating*;

...

while the user remains connected to the audio connection, prompting the user for *the quality of service rating* for services rendered by the selected service provider in response to a detected completion of the live conversation."

Levin does not disclose Applicant claimed feature of "a threshold for a quality of service rating" for the search of a list of service providers. Gisby is limited to a technique to conduct survey after a customer finishes a transaction with an agent of a call center.

Claim 21 also recites "to receive at least one search criterion in an audio form from a user, via the audio connection, the at least one search criterion including *a threshold of a quality*

of service rating” and “while the user remains connected to the audio connection, the processor to prompt the user for *the quality of service rating* for services rendered by the selected service provider in response to a detected completion of the live conversation”.

Since Levin and Gisby do not disclose Applicant’s claimed feature of “the at least one search criterion including *a threshold of a quality of service rating*” to present a list of service providers, where the user is prompted for “*the quality of service rating* for services rendered by the selected service provider” in response to a detected completion of the live conversation between the user and the user selected service provider, claims 1, 11 and 21 and their dependent claims are patentable over Levin and Gisby.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner’s objections have been successfully traversed and that the application is now in order for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the application and allowance thereof is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 12, 2008

/John P. Ward/
John P. Ward
Reg. No. 40,216

Customer Number 72262
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
(650) 328-8500 Telephone
(650) 328-8508 Facsimile